

BUDGET / FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 19, 2016

Oliver Administration Building

Present

Subcommittee: Marjorie McBride, Chair; John Bento (arrived at 7:13 p.m.), and William O'Dell

School Committee, Administration and Staff: John Saviano, Mario Andrade, Superintendent; Pauline Silva, Director of Administration & Finance; and George Simmons, Director of Facilities (arrived at 6:39 p.m.)

Marj M. called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Bill O. made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2015 meeting; seconded by Marj M. The motion passed unanimously.

FACILITIES FOCUS

Chairperson McBride rearranged the order of the meeting to accommodate the Facilities Director who would be arriving a bit later.

Innovative Learning Equipment

Marj M. asked Bill O. to explain to the Subcommittee why he is requesting a discussion on Innovative Learning Equipment.

Bill O. shared with the Subcommittee his desire to see the Bristol Warren Regional School District implement more opportunities for student use of innovative learning equipment. He shared examples of innovative learning styles and equipment.

Mario A. responded that Leslie Anderson, Director of Pupil Services, has provided specialized learning equipment for some students. He gave examples of the types of innovative learning equipment currently in use through Pupil Services.

Mario A. commented that Pre-K through 8th grade teachers are more open to non-traditional learning styles. The high school students are still learning in the traditional sense. Mario A. added that implementation within the District of innovative learning styles and equipment is not systemic yet, but is being researched both at the student level and the budget level.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

Mario A. will provide a report for the April Workshop to the full School Committee on innovative learning styles and equipment currently in use at the BWRSD.

MHHS Fields

Marj M. stated that the bids for Phase 1 of the MHHS Field Project came in over budget. She shared her concern that the current bid only covers mitigation of water at the Naomi Street field, and does not deal with the water issues around the high school. She added that the DEM grant does cover mitigation of the water at the Naomi Street field, but the District would still be required to spend an additional \$600,000 for the new field at that location, while still having water issues around the high school.

Marj M. suggested several avenues for moving forward. She opened the subject up for discussion.

Mario A. responded that PARE Engineering has recommended starting the field project at Naomi Street. Mario A. added that the work at Naomi Street field would still be covered under the DEM permit

Mario A. shared the history of the project beginning with its inception in 2011 where it received Stage 1 approval from RIDE for reimbursement. Mario A. explained RIDE's criteria to qualify for

reimbursement at the time the BWRSD field project was initially approved in 2011. In July 2015, the RIDE reimbursement process for school construction projects changed. RIDE is no longer accepting rolling applications. All school construction applications will be required to go before the School Building Authority. In addition to the new requirements for future school construction applications, the Stage 1 approval initially received in 2011 from RIDE for reimbursement has expired. Mario A. stated that the District can reapply for reimbursement approval in the future which will help for Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the MHHS Fields Project, but does not help for Phase 1. Mario A. has requested that Joe DaSilva, SMMA, provide a written confirmation regarding the new SBA and reimbursement terms.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

The following questions were raised during the discussion:

- How long is the current DEM grant good for?
- Going forward, will this project be reimbursable from RIDE?
- Are the School Committee members and Administrators committed to this project?
- Are the School Committee members and Administrators comfortable with the amount available in Capital Projects?
- What is the bottom line spending amount?
- Can the District afford this project in the “worst case scenario”?

- Can the District allocate the project without damaging other projects?
- Are the School Committee members and Administrators willing to risk the bid amounts continuing to rise by waiting to move forward with the project?

Pauline S. shared the current and projected capital projects amounts.

(John B. arrived at 7:13 p.m.)

The Subcommittee reached a consensus to have Pauline S. put together a report regarding the MHHS Fields Project, to include available options under the new terms and conditions, which will be provided to the School Committee prior to Monday's business meeting. During Monday night's business meeting, the full School Committee will review the options presented and make a decision on how to proceed with the MHHS Fields Project.

MHHS Heating, Ventilation and Air Quality (HVAQ)

George S. reported that he met with Joe DaSilva, SMMA and with a representative from ENE Systems. He stated that approval has been received to replace the heating system, and to install a rooftop unit on the high school gymnasium with an AC option. (The project is reimbursable at \$.76 on the dollar.) George S. added that the approval also includes replacing the large capacity domestic water tank with a smaller, more efficient tank. George S. stated that this

project should be ready to go out to bid the first or second week in February.

KMS Outside Lighting

George S. reported that the project is complete.

Small Truck Bid

George S. stated that there was nothing new to report.

Building Committee Meeting Report

Mario A. shared a report of current projects that are being reviewed by the Building Committee. He added that the Building Committee is in the process of identifying projects for next year. Pauline S. shared the cost of the projects that will go before SBA, and the net cost to the District.

Mario A. commented that the Town Council members view the projects and timelines as sound and well thought out.

BUDGET FOCUS

Budget Preparation Process Overview

(George S. left at 7:50 p.m.)

Bill O. began the discussion by stating that the information he has received in the past as a School Committee member regarding the yearly budget was not extensive enough. He would like more

information to help aid him in providing informed answers to his constituents. Bill O. requested an explanation of the budget preparation process.

Pauline S. explained in detail the budget preparation process for BWRSD. She also provided a draft copy of the BWRSD Five Year Comparison Budget to Actual by Function Code and Funding Source chart.

Marj M. requested that Pauline S. provide relevant pieces of the Budget Process binder to the Subcommittee for use as a working guide.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

FY16 Budget

Pauline S. highlighted several items of note. Questions were asked and answered.

Next meeting – Tuesday, February 16, 2016

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: At 8:28 p.m. Bill O made a motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by John B. The motion passed unanimously.

